

**Enclosure - Summary of Responses to Industry Concerns and Requests in Regard to
Coke Ovens 2022 CAA Section 114 Information Request Expressed in Letter dated August 2, 2022**

Item	COETF Request	EPA Response*	EPA Rationale
1A	Requested an extension of 55 days for enclosure 1, an extension of 50 days to start fenceline monitoring, and an extension of about 50 days to submit fenceline data.	We are extending the Enclosure 1 due date 25 days (now due 9/27/22)	We can provide a 25 day extension and still process responses by end of the year, and stay on schedule to meet the target dates for the proposed rule.
1B		We are not revising any other due dates.	We need to receive the fenceline data and emissions test data on the schedule outlined in the enclosure 2 so that we have sufficient time process the data, and run the risk assessment model, as well as develop MACT limits, where needed (i.e., HNR), and complete the proposed and final rules by the dates described in our declaration to the court.
2A	Eliminate the requirement for flare testing for gas composition (proximate/ultimate analysis), flow rate, and heat content.	Flare testing does not need to be done on batteries because flares are close to top of battery with only small distance between top of battery and flare flame	We recognize this is safety issue and therefore made the change requested.
2B		<p>--Flare testing does not need to be done for CBRP unless there is a sample port.</p> <p>--EPA will accept COG composition analyses in lieu of coke by-product recovery plant (CBRP) flare testing for samples taken at other points in the CBRP process.</p> <p>--VE tests still required for both battery flares and CBRP flares</p>	<p>--We stated in the CAA section 114 test request that testing does not need to be done for CBRP unless there is a sample port.</p> <p>--Operating hours and emission factors are insufficient in light of advances in knowledge of flare operation, especially with respect to assisted flares, as noted in the refinery NESHAP rule (40 CFR part 63, subpart CC). See also "Parameters for Properly Designed and Operated Flares" (April 2012) https://www3.epa.gov/airtoxics/flare/2012flaretechreport.pdf</p> <p>--However, -COG composition data would be useful and likely similar to results with flare testing.</p>
3	Eliminate interior fugitive monitoring because it would not produce useful information, because interior monitors would not accurately distinguish between sources of emissions within coke	We disagree. This needs to stay in the required testing.	We conclude that this data is needed to help characterize contribution of sources to fenceline emissions. We understand there is likely to be some overlap of HAP constituents and some unavoidable mixing of fugitives. Nevertheless, the data will be useful for our overall analyses.

**Enclosure - Summary of Responses to Industry Concerns and Requests in Regard to
Coke Ovens 2022 CAA Section 114 Information Request Expressed in Letter dated August 2, 2022**

Item	COETF Request	EPA Response*	EPA Rationale
	plants. or reduce to passive samplers		
3A	Leak Detection and Repair (LDAR) information already exists and could be used in lieu of proposed interior monitoring.	If speciated LDAR data are available this would be helpful.	LDAR does not provide the level of detail we are asking for in interior monitoring requirement; it is not equivalent. Levels allowed by LDAR are 500 ppm (per part 61 subpart L), are not compound specific, and the frequency at which an individual component is checked is not short, i.e., a leak could exist for the period of time between evaluations. The purpose of the interior monitoring is not to evaluate the effectiveness of the LDAR program, but instead is to characterize the air in the process areas. These data collected will be used to inform the results of the fenceline monitoring.
4A	Reduce fenceline locations to 1 or 2 upwind and 1 downwind	The fenceline testing needs to stay in the required testing. We are not making any changes to fenceline testing except for a couple small changes to required methods described below in this table.	Sufficient speciated fenceline data is very important to determine the emissions impact to the surrounding community. In the case of complex meteorological conditions, a smaller number of sample locations would amplify the effect of any confounding factors on the results
4B	Use available ambient monitoring data instead of requiring fenceline tests.		Off-site ambient monitoring is not sufficient for the purpose of our effort, which is to better verify/characterize the fenceline impact of the emissions from a given facility at the fenceline and the contribution of various sources at the facility.
4C	The number of monitors that would be required at each facility as per Method 325A is substantial and not viable for implementation based on the time frames prescribed by the 114.		After reviewing the affected acreage of the facilities as well as the approaches in the Draft Fenceline Test Plans, each facility is proposing twelve monitoring locations. Method 325A is designed so that the flux may be determined for the fenceline of any size facility, and the proportional distribution of fenceline sampling locations allows for the determination of flux throughout the facility/affected area. Based all facilities utilizing the minimum number of sampling locations, this number (12) does not appear prohibitive nor unviable.

**Enclosure - Summary of Responses to Industry Concerns and Requests in Regard to
Coke Ovens 2022 CAA Section 114 Information Request Expressed in Letter dated August 2, 2022**

Item	COETF Request	EPA Response*	EPA Rationale
4D	The EPA sampling methods (e.g., TO-13A) that require a facility to have a power source are not viable based on the timeframes prescribed by the CAA section 114 request; any new electrical connections likely would take several months to install, which could not be accomplished in the allotted timeframe. In addition, some state agencies require air quality permits to be obtained prior to installation of generators, including small, temporary units.		<p>We believe facilities can work out a way to provide power. We have attempted to minimize the sample locations requiring power by:</p> <p>--Being non-specific in terms of siting requirements-- we merely stated “downwind” and “upwind” -- so that a facility could make educated decisions about placement of sampling locations to deal with potential power issues.</p> <p>--We are requiring fewer sample locations for TO-13A , which needs power, compared to Method 325A, which does not.</p>
4E	Six months of monitoring is excessive		One year would have been preferable in order to take into account more seasonal variability, but we concluded that 6-months is sufficient, will be less costly for industry, and will fit better in the anticipated court ordered rule schedule.
5A	Allow previous test reports	Previous test reports will be accepted but they need to be within 5 years (2017 or later) and use same methods as required in the CAA section 114 request. Testing also must have been conducted at conditions representative of current operations. In addition, emissions data must be presented in the units specified in Enclosure 2. EPA reserves the right to, upon review of the data and finding it not representative	If tests are not performed the same as the required tests, the data may not be useful or valid and, minimally, cannot be combined with data from sources that follow the 114 test requirements

**Enclosure - Summary of Responses to Industry Concerns and Requests in Regard to
Coke Ovens 2022 CAA Section 114 Information Request Expressed in Letter dated August 2, 2022**

Item	COETF Request	EPA Response*	EPA Rationale
		or usable for the purposes of the CAA section 114 request, to require the testing of any identified parameters.	
5B	Stack tests must be simultaneous with fugitive tests	This is not required in the CAA section 114 request.	
6	Regarding the requirement to repeat the 1981 study that was the basis of door leak AP-42 emissions factor (i.e., Method 303, visual readings, of leaks from both bench and yard), COETF requests that EPA remove all requirements that involve performing Method 303 observations from the coke battery bench because of safety concerns (e.g., moving equipment, very high temperatures). There are significant worker safety concerns with having Method 303 observers working from the bench based on historical multiple bench-related fatalities, and the difficulty of performing door leak observations of taller batteries from the bench (versus from the yard). Facilities have provided photos and other evidence of hazards and descriptions of 11 past OSHA fatality incidents due to bench -related accidents that have occurred since 1984.	<p>Jerry Crowder (training manager from Crowder Environmental Associates, the company that certifies all of the EPA Method 303 observers in the U.S.) said that there is availability of method 303 readers and his opinion is that the readers are trained to do bench readings. As to the hazards of bench measurements, Jerry said “Conducting Method 303 door inspections from the bench can be done with greater safety if all moving equipment on the coke side is moved to the end of the battery and parked for the duration of the inspection.”</p> <p>We have not yet decided whether or not to maintain a requirement to conduct this study with Method 303 bench readings. We need to do more evaluation of potential safety issues and potential alternative</p>	We think it would be beneficial to obtain EPA Method 303 bench readings (as described in the enclosure 2 dated June 29, 2022) to support the development of an improved, more robust revised equation to estimate door leak emissions, which have historically been a risk driver for this source category. However, we do not want to impose any requirements that may impose potential safety issues. To help prevent safety issues, we understand that the method 303 readings from the bench could potentially be done safely if all relevant moving equipment were shut-off during the time personnel are on or near the bench. For example, we understand that moving equipment could potentially be shut off for a number of minutes while method 303 readings are being taken, and then readers could pause as needed to allow machines (e.g., pushing and door machines) to be turned back on (e.g., for periods of time), as needed to maintain process operations. However, we have heard some comments that this approach would not reflect normal operations and may be disruptive to process operations. Nevertheless, we need to evaluate these issues further before we make a decision regarding the request to remove the Method 303 readings from the bench.

**Enclosure - Summary of Responses to Industry Concerns and Requests in Regard to
Coke Ovens 2022 CAA Section 114 Information Request Expressed in Letter dated August 2, 2022**

Item	COETF Request	EPA Response*	EPA Rationale
		ways to conduct such study in a way that minimizes any safety concerns.	
7	CBRP testing with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) Appendix P method to test volatile HAPS and total hydrocarbons on CBRP cooling tower inlets should be eliminated:	We are not removing testing requirements for cooling towers using TCEQ.	It is a valid method used in other NESHAP and needed to determine potential VOC leakage. See details below.
7A	The TCEQ method is not an EPA method and can't be used for compounds with boiling points higher than 140F.		The TCEQ method has been incorporated by reference into part 63 (at 63.14(t)) through use in 4 NESHAP (subparts CC, XX, FFFF, and HHHHHHH). We think it is feasible to test these emissions because it is being done in other industries (e.g., Petroleum Refinery NESHAP) for closed loop systems such as these and also at once through heat exchangers. Also, it has been required as part of the HRVOC rule in Texas (TAC 115.764(a)) since 2003. Modifications to the method to sample for the higher boiling point compounds are specified in the CAA section 114 request, the use of either TO-15A or TO-15 for the collection and analysis in addition to the standard THC analyzer approach.
7B	There is not any leakage of VOC in noncontact cooling water towers		Even in a non-contact cooling tower the potential for VOC leaks means that there is potential contact between the cooling water and the stream being cooled. We think it is important to conduct such testing because this could be a significant emission source, as found in the Petroleum Refineries NESHAP (40 CFR part 63, subpart CC). There is a high volume of water passing through the cooling tower, so even a relatively small concentration of organic HAP in the water could be stripped resulting in a large amount of emissions.

**Enclosure - Summary of Responses to Industry Concerns and Requests in Regard to
Coke Ovens 2022 CAA Section 114 Information Request Expressed in Letter dated August 2, 2022**

Item	COETF Request	EPA Response*	EPA Rationale
8	No labs are accredited to use TO-15A	TO-15 can be used instead	While we would like to have laboratories using the most up-to-date methodology, we agree that TO-15 still would provide us with precise and accurate measurements at the fenceline and interior of the facility.
9	BTEX is listed in 114 Table 1-A, but is not included in Table 1-B. Consequently, it is not clear whether EPA intends for BTEX sampling to be conducted. In any case, testing of cooling tower inlet systems for BTEX would not be appropriate for the same reasons discussed above for VOCs.	BTEX sampling is required as part of the TO-15/15A analyte list.	BTEX was not specifically called out in Table 1-B, but is included in the TO-15A and TO-15 analyte list, a copy of which was included in the 114.

* The text in red font reflects changes we made in response to comments or requests from COETF.

* The text in blue font reflects an issue/request expressed by COETF for which EPA has not yet decided.